

Message

From: Moran, Robin [moran.rob@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/1/2017 2:35:44 PM
To: Moskalik, Andrew [Moskalik.Andrew@epa.gov]; Kargul, John [kargul.john@epa.gov]
CC: Haugen, David [haugen.david@epa.gov]; Olechiw, Michael [olechiw.michael@epa.gov]; Charmley, William [charmley.william@epa.gov]; Bolon, Kevin [Bolon.Kevin@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: history of Alliance's desire for more than one vehicle model
Attachments: AAM commentary_RM.pptx

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Moskalik, Andrew
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2017 9:00 AM
To: Kargul, John <kargul.john@epa.gov>
Cc: Haugen, David <haugen.david@epa.gov>; Olechiw, Michael <olechiw.michael@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Bolon, Kevin <Bolon.Kevin@epa.gov>; Moran, Robin <moran.rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: history of Alliance's desire for more than one vehicle model

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

=====
Andrew Moskalik, PhD, PE
US Environmental Protection Agency, NVFEL
2565 Plymouth Rd
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
(734) 214-4719

From: Kargul, John
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Moskalik, Andrew <Moskalik.Andrew@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: history of Alliance's desire for more than one vehicle model

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Charmley, William" <charmley.william@epa.gov>
Date: December 1, 2017 at 5:12:23 AM EST
To:
Subject: RE: history of Alliance's desire for more than one vehicle model

David –

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Bill

From: Haugen, David

Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 6:27 PM

To: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Barba, Daniel <Barba.Daniel@epa.gov>; Kargul, John <kargul.john@epa.gov>

Subject: history of Alliance's desire for more than one vehicle model

Text below excerpted from a 2008 Alliance letter (attached, from Julie Becker) to Chet and Julie Abraham:

Our purpose in writing this letter is to encourage you in your final deliberations to use more than one modeling approach in estimating the potential improvements in fuel economy expected from the deployment of the individual technologies you are considering as well as combinations of those technologies. Our expectation would be that if the estimated fuel economy impacts generated by different models are similar, then the results would be considered robust. If there were significant discrepancies between estimates generated by one or more models, then either the accuracy of the models or the veracity of an individual model's fuel economy improvement estimate should be considered suspect.